

**MINUTES**  
**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
**August 2, 2006**  
**Aeronautics Building**  
**Lansing, Michigan**

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

**Present**

Carmine Palombo, Chairman  
Robert Slattery, Vice-Chairman  
Steve Warren, Member  
Jerry Richards, Member  
Kirk Steudle, Member  
Susan Mortel, Member

Howard Heidemann, Member  
Spencer Nebel, Member  
David Bee, Member  
Bill McEntee, Member  
Rob Surber, Member  
Frank Kelley, Commission Advisor

**Staff Present**

Rick Lilly- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Stacey Schafer- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Ron Vibbert- Bureau of Transportation Planning

**Absent**

None

**Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.

**Approval of July 12, 2006 Minutes - Rick Lilly**

**Mr. Bee moved to approve the minutes, supported by Mr. Richards. Motion carried.**

**Correspondence and Announcements - Rick Lilly**

Mr. Lilly informed the Council that the 2007 budget was passed by the Legislature, but has not been signed by the governor yet. The 2008 budget was passed by the State Transportation Commission.

Mr. Lilly stated that the Midwest University Transportation Center, in Wisconsin, was not selected by FHWA to continue in its role. At this point we are unsure of our relationship with them.

Mr. Palombo indicated that, along with Mr. Steudle and Ron Vibbert, were involved in a Peer Review Conference presentation. The conference was meant to share experiences of some of the things that are being done with other state agencies. The presentation was well received.

Mr. Palombo made a presentation to the State Transportation Commission on the accomplishments of the Council. Mr. Surber made a presentation on the Internet Reporting Tool and they were very impressed. All of the Commissioners were provided with an access code to use this tool.

Mr. Palombo touched on the issue of Senate Bill 1182, dealing with a single reporting process for Act 51. This has passed both the House and Senate; it has yet to be signed by the Governor.

### **Agency Reports**

There were no agency reports.

### **Approval of Pilot Study Process – Administrative & Education Committee**

Mr. Nebel informed the Council that the draft language of the pilot project process was handed out. The committee made several adjustments to the language. Some of the changes were fairly minor. Some of the significant changes that were made to the proposals were that they should not exceed \$50,000; also a provision was added stating that the Council will not make any payments in excess of 50% of the cost prior to the final submission and acceptance by the Council.

Each category will be rated on an acceptable/needs additional work/unacceptable basis. There will be a point system, with five points being given for acceptable, 2 ½ points for needs additional work, and 0 points being given for unacceptable basis. The appropriate Council committees will review a report from staff and make a final determination.

Mr. Steudle asked how much money we were going to be spending on these pilots. Mr. Lilly indicated that there is \$200,000 budgeted for 2007 pilots. Mr. Steudle indicated that just because we have the money does not mean that we need to spend it all. There needs to be a process in place for those pilots that are similar.

**Mr. Nebel moved for the approval of the revised Pilot Study Process. If proposals are similar in type the earliest received will be given priority. Supported by Mr. Warren. Motion carried as amended.**

**Approval of Guidelines for the Collection of Roadway Condition Data on the Non-Federal Aid Eligible Roads and Streets – Data Management Committee**

**Mr. McEntee moved to approve the guidelines, supported by Mr. Richards.**

Mr. Warren stated that one of our overall objectives, with regard to Non-federal Aid System, is to understand where are the Non-Federal aid roads. Before we can assess the condition of local paved roads we need to know where local roads are and whether they are paved or unpaved. Ms. Mortel stated that through the Act 51 process, roads are certified every year and we know where the roads are and whether or not they are gravel. Mr. Surber stated that we know where the roads are through the Act 51 process, but it does not indicate if they are gravel or not. Mr. McEntee indicated that CGI might be able to do this mathematically without determining of the types of unpaved roads which surface it is, whether its ever been approved ever or if it's a seasonal dirt road. Mr. McEntee is concerned that we do not know for sure what information we want to get about the gravel roads. The PASER ratings were not helpful on the gravel roads. There are not many people who have recently had training on the unpaved roads and what they are supposed to look at. Mr. McEntee stated that he is in favor of getting an accurate inventory of them and suggested that the Council might want to bring the two activities together by the Spring. Mr. Warren mentioned that it is incumbent upon the Council to collect information on the local road system that we know where/what they are. Mr. Palombo thought that this might better be addressed as part of the CGI work program. It seems like it's a bigger issue then what we are dealing with here.

Mr. Steudle stated that because we are talking about a pilot we are not going to get every paved, non-federal road out there. Mr. Steudle stated that this might best be addressed as a separate issue. Mr. Warren agreed that it needs to be part of the overall discussion as this becomes more developed of building that database.

Mr. Warren indicated that in talking with the County Road Association of Michigan, there is a lot of high traffic volume on gravel roads. In terms of managing our assets we need to know where those are and how many there are. Mr. Steudle agrees that traffic volumes are ultimately an important component to any analysis.

Mr. Palombo stated that at the committee it was determined that just because an application was filled out, it does not mean that it will be purchased. It should be noted that the Council is not going to pay for any collection on gravel roads.

Mr. Steudle does not think that there is enough information indicated in the process for quality assurance. Mr. Lilly stated that in regards to quality assurance and control, MDOT does not have the resources to do it. Any

process would have to be conducted by someone else. Ms. Mortel thinks that we should be stating the requirements under quality control. Everything needs to be stated as requirements. If the guidelines are approved, in terms of quality assurance, we are asking agencies to tell us what their quality assurance process is. This will be reviewed before we agree to pay them.

**Mr. Nebel moved to refer back to committee for further discussion, supported by Mr. Bee. Motion failed.**

**Mr. McEntee moved to amend the guidelines as follows: The Council will apply a sample method to evaluate the quality of data received. Reimbursement will be made if data quality meets or exceeds what we currently have on the Federal-Aid System, supported by Mr. Richards. Motion carried.**

**Mr. Slattery moved to amend the guidelines as follows: Data Collection for 2006 must be consistent with the PASER collection business rules used on the Federal-Aid System, supported by Mr. Richards. Motion carried as amended.**

**On the question to approve the guidelines as amended: Motion carried.**

#### **Demonstration of Automated Van – Abed Itani, Grand Valley Metro Council**

Abed Itani gave the Council a presentation on the Automated Van and how it is used. After Mr. Itani's presentation, the Council was given a demonstration of the Automated Van.

#### **Other Issues**

Mr. Lilly recommended that the Council cancel the September Council meeting.

**Mr. Bee motioned to cancel the September Council meeting, supported by Mr. Warren. Motion Carried.**

#### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment

#### **Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.